UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,754	03/29/2006	Tatsuya Nakazawa	029471-0201	4000
	7590 01/15/201 ARDNER LLP	EXAMINER		
SUITE 500	——- T NIW	MASUR, PAUL H		
3000 K STREE WASHINGTO			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2464	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/15/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/573,754	NAKAZAWA ET AL.		
Examiner initiated interview cummary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Paul Masur	2464		
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Per</u>	Status of Application: <u>Pending</u>		
(1) <u>Paul Masur</u> .	(3)			
(2) <u>Annora Bell</u> .	(4)			
Date of Interview: <u>12 January 2010</u>	Time: <u>2 <i>PM</i></u>			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)			
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed:				
Claims discussed: 48-51, 53-59, 61-68				
Prior art documents discussed:				
Part II.				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:		
Part III.				
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate of directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate of did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar 	e examiner will provide a writter record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview		
/Paul Masur/ Examiner, Art Unit 2464 (A	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

On 1/12/2010, the examiner had an interview with the applicant's representative to discuss the case. During this conversation, the examiner presented several issues to the applicant's representative in an attempt to place the case in condition for allowance.

Specifically, the examiner presented issues pertaining to lack of antecedent basis in claims 53, 54, 55, and 61. The applicant's representative agreed to remedy these issues. In addition, the examiner presented limitations in claims 48-51, 53-59, 61, and 68 as being indefinite. These limitations pertained to the error concealment processing and discarding of encoded data packets that were delayed or lost. The examiner noted that the limitations were potentially indefinite as it was not readily clear how the error concealment processing or discarding of encoded packets were initiated. As a means to better define the invention in the claims, and overcome these indefinite matters, the examiner suggested that the applicant incorporate into the claims the matter in fig. 4, steps 4-9, and fig. 5, steps 15-22, for the first embodiment of the invention. For the second embodiment of the invention, the examiner suggested the applicant incorporate into the claims the matter in fig. 8, steps 34-40, and fig. 9, steps 56-64.

Due to scheduling constraints and the examiner's need to take emergency leave, the examiner and applicant's representative were not able to come to a expeditious conclusion of these matters. The examiner sincerely appreciates the representative's patience and understanding through this process. The examiner invites the applicant's representative to contact him in the future, if the client so desires, to discuss these issues and any other issues further.